



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,831	12/27/2000	Stephen Heisig	YOR920000705US1	6296

7590 02/09/2005
Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,831

Applicant(s)

HEISIG ET AL.

Examiner

VAN H NGUYEN

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the request for continued examination filed November 22, 2004.
2. Claims 1-5 and 10-15 are presented for execution.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 22, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 2-5 and 10-15 are objected to because of the following informalities: Dependent claims 2-5 and 10-15 should start with "the computer system" as they are referring to "a computer system" of independent claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 4, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **De Borst et al.** (U.S. 6,173,327).

7. **As to claim 1:**

De Borst teaches the invention as claimed including a computer system (*e.g., an Information Matrix computer 40, col.4, line 52-53 and fig.1*) coupled to work stations operated by remote clients (*fig.1*) comprising:

- a. an object server container (*e.g., INFORMATION MATRIX 69, fig. 5*) that comprises a plurality of server objects (*e.g., HTTP GATEWAY 137, GOPHER GATEWAY 139, FTP GATEWAY 141, LOCAL FILE SERVER 143, fig. 5*) relating to specific, respective object servers (*e.g., HTTP, GOPHER, NNTP; fig. 5*) of the workstations;
- b. a protocol adapter framework (*e.g., Adapter abstractions; col.7, lines 55-59 and fig. 5*) that provides access to the server objects from the remote clients (*Fig. 5*),

that comprises a plurality of protocol adapters (*e.g., a Hypertext Transport Protocol Adapter 131, a Gopher protocol adapter 133, and a Network News Transport Protocol Adapter 135; col. 7, lines 55-59 and fig. 5*), that supports one or more appropriate arbitrary protocols (*e.g., fig.5 shows HTTP ADAPTER 131 supporting HTTP; GOPHER ADAPTER 133 supporting GOPHER protocol; and NTTP ADAPTER 135 supporting NNTP; fig. 5*) between the clients and the server objects (*fig.5*), and that responds to client requests (*e.g., incoming requests; fig.5*) in the arbitrary protocols received via the protocol adapters (*fig.5*) to derive therefrom method requests on an object residing within at least one of the object server (*e.g., the Adapter abstraction provides a method for requesters to retrieve information from the Information matrix 69; col.7, lines 49-51*).

8. **As to claim 4:**

De Borst teaches the protocol adapter framework includes HTTP adapter (*e.g., HTTP adapter 131; fig. 5*).

9. **As to claim 10:**

De Borst teaches the object server container provides services (*e.g., gateways and servers are referred to as "information providers" since both provide information to Adapters; col.7, line 62-col.8, line 1*), and wherein the server objects are operable to access the services (*e.g., fig.5 shows services are providing by HTTP GATEWAY 137, GOPHER GATEWAY 139, FTP GATEWAY 141, and LOCAL FILE SERVER 145*).

Art Unit: 2126

10. As to claim 11:

De Borst teaches ones of the server objects relate to specific, respective ones of the arbitrary protocols that are used by specific, respective object servers of the workstations to access corresponding ones of the server objects (*e.g., fig.5 shows HTTP GATEWAY 137 relates to HTTP; GOPHER GATEWAY 139 relates to GOPHER protocol for retrieving and satisfying requests from clients*).

11. As to claim 12

De Borst teaches the method requests (*e.g., incoming HTTP request, incoming GOPHER request; fig. 5*) are for the services (*e.g., outgoing HTTP request, outgoing GOPHER request; fig. 5*).

12. As to claim 13:

De Borst teaches the services run in a first protocol (*e.g., TCP; col.4, lines 51-57*) in the object server container, and wherein the first protocol differs from the arbitrary protocols (*e.g., HTTP, GOPHER, and NNTP; fig. 5*).

13. As to claim 14:

De Borst teaches the protocol adapter framework processes an output generated by one of the object servers in response to a client request for transport to the requesting client according to a transport protocol expected by the requesting client (*e.g., the Adapter abstraction includes an adapter component that provides the logic for accepting a request and translating the request ... provides the logic for returning a reply to the requestor... a reply can be created by taking the context and producing a protocol-specific reply; col.14, lines 27-39*).

Art Unit: 2126

14. **As to claim 15:**

De Borst teaches the transport protocol is selected from the group consisting of: an arbitrary protocol (*e.g.*, *GOPHER protocol; fig.5*) of the requesting client and a second protocol (*e.g.*, *Internet protocol; col.4, lines 51-57*) that differs from the arbitrary protocol of the requesting client.

15. Claims 2, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **De Borst et al.** in view of **Aharoni et al.** (U.S.6,014,694). Aharoni was cited in the previous office action.

16. **As to claim 2:**

- a. De Borst teaches a web server (*e.g.*, *HTTP GATEWAY 137; fig. 5*). De Borst, however, does not specifically teach a video server.
- b. Aharoni teaches a video server (*e.g.*, *video server; col.11, lines 25-44*).
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aharoni and De Borst because Aharoni's teachings would have provided the capability for accepting a remote client connection request, retrieving a local or remote stored video file, and transmitting the video file to the video client.

17. **As to claim 3:**

- a. De Borst teaches a web browser (*e.g.*, *WWW BROWSER 49; fig. 1 and col.5, line 1*).

Art Unit: 2126

- b. Additionally, De Borst teaches a video display terminal (col.1, lines 60-61). There must be a video player included in De Borst's system for playing a video file on the video display terminal. De Borst, however, is silent on a video player.
 - c. Aharoni teaches a video player (*e.g., video player; col.17, lines 38-51*).
 - d. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aharoni and De Borst because Aharoni's teachings would have provided the capability for playing the video file on the video client.
18. **As to claim 5:**
- a. De Borst does teach "additional Adapter abstractions could be added for other types of information retrieval requests" (col.7, lines 54-60). De Borst, however, is silent on a video protocol adapter.
 - b. Aharoni teaches a video protocol adapter (col.19, lines 9-41).
 - c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aharoni and De Borst because Aharoni's teaching would have provided the capability for efficiently browsing a video file from the video server and receiving the video file on the video client.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 and 10-15 have been fully considered, but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.
21. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756.
22. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



Van H. Nguyen